

**Remarks**

Claims 1-10 are pending.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected.

Claim 10 has been cancelled.

Claims 1-9 are submitted herein for review.

No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the previously cited Fischer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,349,004) and Geist (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0030597) in view of the newly cited Fantone et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4784118).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contentions and submits the following remarks in response.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a light pipe for use in an electronic display arrangement. The pipe includes a transparent optical relay made of a single piece designed to transmit light signals from an entry surface receiving light from a micro display to an exit surface going toward the eye of a user for viewing a virtual image. The pipe includes a diffractive component, being an element satisfying the equation of an aspherical body of revolution, and being *directly formed on the entry surface of the relay*.

The cited prior art, namely, Fischer discloses a light pipe for use in particular in an electronic display arrangement and designed to transmit light signals from one of its ends referred to as an entry surface to its other end referred to as an exit surface going towards the eye

of the user for viewing an image. The pipe includes a diffractive component, being an element satisfying the equation of an aspherical body of revolution.

The cited prior art, namely Geist, discloses an electronic display arrangement suitable for being mounted on a frame of the spectacles type or on a specific system for being positioned in front of the eyes of a user.

The Fantone reference relates to an apparatus for viewing a region within a body cavity like an endoscope.

Firstly, Applicant submits that the Fantone reference relates to a specific technical field which is different from the technical field of the present application and is therefore non analogous art. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would not seek to combine the Fantone reference with Fischer and Geist.

Secondly, even if the references were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the resulting structure would still not teach or suggest all of the elements as claimed in independent claim 1. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion in any one of Fischer, Geist or Fantone, either alone or in combination with one another that discloses a light pipe being of a single piece, *with a diffractive component formed directly on the entry surface* of the light pipe's transparent optical relay.

For at least the foregoing reason, Applicant requests that the rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn. Also, as claims 2-9 depend from claim 1, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-9 are in condition for allowance, the earliest possible notice of which is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner feels that an interview would facilitate the prosecution of this Application he is invited

Application No. 10/593,188  
Amendment Dated July 20, 2009  
Reply to Office Action Dated March 19, 2009

to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: July 20, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

SOFER & HAROUN, L.L.P.

By \_\_\_/Joseph Sofer/\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph Sofer  
Reg. No 34,438  
317 Madison Avenue  
Suite 910  
New York, NY 10017  
212-697-2800  
Customer # 39600